

1 By letter dated August 2, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel
2 (DOP). In his letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the
3 Information Technology Applications Specialist (ITAS) 5 classification.

4
5 On June 13, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of
6 Appellant's position. By letter dated May 19, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
7 position was properly allocated to the ITAS 4 classification. On June 16, 2000, Appellant appealed
8 the Director's determination to the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions to the
9 Director's determination are the subject of this proceeding.

10
11 Appellant works in Respondent's central Division of Information Resource Management. The
12 central organization supports the agency's infrastructure and agency-wide applications. Appellant is
13 responsible for the agency-wide Microsoft SQL system and all related databases. Appellant's
14 responsibilities are considered to have a high impact on the agency because of the number of people
15 and divisions who access the system and utilize the information maintained therein.

16
17 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the SQL platform is a high risk
18 statewide system and that if the system fails, he is responsible for troubleshooting the problem and
19 bringing the system and/or users back "on-line." Appellant argues that he supports and maintains
20 the AFRS Data Distribution System (ADDS), the Cost Allocation System (CAS) and the
21 Management Reporting System (MRS). Appellant contends that each of these databases is agency-
22 wide in scope and high impact to the program managers, staff and budget program specialists who
23 rely on the financial information to determine budget status, grant and contract expenditures and to
24 extract information for report writing and to answer questions from internal and external customers.
25 Appellant does not have supervisory responsibility, but he asserts that he provides technical advice,

1 coaches and teaches others who have having problems running the server. Therefore, Appellant
2 asserts that his position should be allocated to the ITAS 5 classification.

3
4 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the SQL system has not been
5 identified as a mission critical system and that if the system failed, while inconvenient, it would not
6 result in a critical impact to the mission of the agency. Respondent contends that the information in
7 the SQL system could be recovered from other sources. Respondent further contends that internal
8 customers use the SQL system and that it is not used by external departments, the general public, or
9 other local health jurisdictions. Respondent also contends that Appellant is not assigned
10 responsibility to coach, mentor or supervise others. Therefore, Respondent argues that Appellant's
11 position is properly allocated to the ITAS 4 classification.

12
13 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
14 allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.

15
16 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Applications Specialist 4, class code 03273,
17 and Information Technology Applications Specialist 5, class code 03274.

18
19 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
20 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
21 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
22 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
23 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
24 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
25 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
26 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1
2 Position allocations are “based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
3 performed and other information and recommendations.” (WAC 356-20-200). Because a current
4 and accurate description of a position’s duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
5 classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a
6 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as
7 documented in the CQ. Jacobson v. Dept of Ecology, PAB No. ALLO 99-0004 (2000).

8
9 Appellant's CQ indicates that he is the agency-level technical expert for database management
10 systems and that he is assigned responsibility for large scale Microsoft SQL-Service databases with
11 high risk and impact. The CQ is signed by Appellant's first- and second-line supervisors and
12 neither disagreed with the duties described in Appellant's CQ.

13
14 At the ITAS 4 level, incumbents perform senior, professional level duties with a focus on system
15 specific applications, rather than agency-wide applications, and are responsible for "multiple
16 applications of moderate size/complexity or a large, major application that is vital to program
17 delivery." In addition, incumbents are required to have an awareness of impact across business
18 units and incumbents.

19
20 The breadth of Appellant's responsibilities go beyond the ITAS 4 classification.

21
22 At the ITAS 5 level, incumbents are professional, technical specialists whose positions focus on and
23 are responsible for agency-level, large-scale applications, projects or databases that have high risk
24 and impact. Incumbents at this level utilize broad technical knowledge in analyzing, consulting,
25 designing, programming, maintaining, or supporting major applications, support products, projects,

1 databases or database management systems. The positions at this level have state-wide focus and
2 responsibility.

3
4 Appellant is responsible for a state-wide, large-scale application and related databases that cross
5 division lines in financial impact. Appellant's position interfaces with outside agencies such as the
6 Office of Financial Management and the Department of Personnel. On a best fit basis, the scope
7 and level of responsibilities of Appellant's position best fit the ITAS 5 classification.

8
9 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be granted and his position should be
10 reallocated to the ITAS 5 classification. The determination of the Director, dated May 19, 2000,
11 should be reversed.

12
13 **ORDER**

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Edward Lamson is granted,
15 the determination of the Director, dated May 19, 2000, is reversed, and Appellant's position is
16 reallocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification.

17 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

18
19 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

20 _____
21 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

22 _____
23 Leana D. Lamb, Member

24
25
26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504